



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/741,306	12/19/2003	Michael Wengrovitz	134132	4396
77216	7590	09/11/2008		
ALCATEL-LUCENT C/O GALASSO & ASSOCIATES, LP P. O. BOX 26503 AUSTIN, TX 78755-0503			EXAMINER RUTKOWSKI, JEFFREY M	
			ART UNIT 2619	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/11/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/741,306

**Applicant(s)**

WENGROVITZ ET AL.

**Examiner**

JEFFREY M. RUTKOWSKI

**Art Unit**

2619

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 13-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 13-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/5508)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

**Claims 6-12** have been cancelled.

#### *Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114*

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 07/11/2008 has been entered.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

2. The following is a quotation of the first and second paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. **Claims 1-5** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification does not adequately describe how the feature of "...redirecting the media to the first device..." is implemented.

4. **Claims 1-5 and 13-19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear what is meant by a "...logical device..." in independent **claims 1 and 13**.

5. For **claims 1-5**, it is unclear what is meant by "...redirecting the media to the first device." The redirection feature appears to imply that information destined for any of the media devices will always be sent to the first device, in the set of one or more devices.

6. For **claims 1-5 and 14-16**, it unclear what is meant the word redirecting in the phrases "...redirecting the media to the first device..." and "...redirecting the media to the second communication port..." (Emphasis added) in **claims 1 and 14**.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
8. Claims **1-5** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gallant (US 2002/0131575) in view of Sternagle (US 2002/0184376).

9. **Regarding claim 1**, Gallant teaches a server (see Fig. 4 Box 22) coupled to the voice switch (see Fig. 4 Box 14) and the network of one or more first devices (see Fig. 4 Box 18), the server maintaining for at least one of the first devices a logical device adhering to the first protocol (see Fig. 4 Box 22), the server further receiving media directed to the logical device and redirecting the media to the first device (see Fig. 4 Box 30). Gallant teaches all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of maintaining separate logical devices. However, Sternagle teaches a single device with multiple SIP devices within it (see paragraph 29). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the system of Sternagle in the system of Gallant to reduce bottleneck and increase performance.
10. **Regarding claim 2**, Gallant further teaches the server further translates media transmitted to the logical device according to the first protocol to media adhering to the second protocol (see paragraph 31 lines 16-18), the media adhering to the second protocol being redirected to the first device (see paragraph 34 lines 1-4).
11. **Regarding claim 3**, Gallant further teaches where the first protocol is a private signaling and voice protocol (see paragraph 30 lines 5-9).
12. **Regarding claim 4**, Gallant further teaches where the second protocol is a session initiation protocol (see paragraph 30 lines 5-9).
13. **Regarding claim 5**, Gallant further teaches the server stores a mapping of an address associated with the logical device with an address associated with the first device (see paragraph 34 lines 1-4).

14. Claims **13-19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young et al. (US 2003/0093563) in view of Sternagle (US 2002/0184376).

15. **Regarding claim 13**, Young teaches receiving from the voice switch a first message indicative of a first communication port to be used by a particular device for receiving media (see paragraph 77 lines 1-5); receiving from the particular device a second message indicative of a second communication port to be used by the particular device for receiving media (see paragraph 76 lines 1-7); and reconciling a difference between the first communication port and the second communication port (see paragraph 80 lines 1-6). Young teaches all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of maintaining separate logical devices. However, Sternagle teaches a single device with multiple SIP devices within it (see paragraph 29). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the system of Sternagle in the system of Young to reduce bottleneck and increase performance.

16. **Regarding claim 14**, Young further teaches mapping the first communication port to the second communication port (see paragraph 75 lines 7-12); receiving media addressed to the first communication port; and redirecting the media to the second communication port (see paragraph 75 lines 7-12).

17. **Regarding claim 15**, Young further teaches where the mapping statically allocates the first communication port to the second communication port (see paragraph 80 lines 1-7).

18. **Regarding claim 16**, Young further teaches where the mapping dynamically allocates the first communication port to the second communication port (see paragraph 80 lines 1-7).

19. **Regarding claim 17**, Young further teaches translating media transmitted to the first communication port according to the first protocol to media adhering to the second protocol (see

paragraph 82 lines 1-6), where the redirecting of the media comprises redirecting the media adhering to the second protocol to the second communication port (see paragraph 77 lines 1-5).

20. **Regarding claim 18**, Young further teaches where the first protocol is a private signaling and voice protocol (see paragraph 82 lines 1-6).

21. **Regarding claim 19**, Young further teaches where the second protocol is a session initiation protocol (see paragraph 82 lines 1-6).

***Response to Arguments***

22. Argument:

23. While it is true that Sternagle discloses a single device with multiple SIP devices within it as disclosed above, this is not the equivalent of "the server maintaining for each of said at least one of the first devices a separate logical device adhering to the first protocol." FIG. 1 of the present application, the relevant discussion pertaining to that figure discussed herein and previously amended Claim 1 reveal that there is a separate IP set in the proxy server for each SIP set not a single device with multiple SIP devices or a SIP signaling router that includes a plurality of cluster nodes that perform SIP protocol functions as discussed in Sternagle. No disclosure in any of the cited references shows a server maintaining for each of said at least one of the first devices a separate logical device adhering to the first protocol.

24. Response:

25. It is not clear how IP is considered to be the first protocol because the claim preamble seems to suggest the first protocol and the second protocol operate at the same OSI layer.

**Claims 3 and 18** further define the first protocol as a voice and signaling protocol, not a transport protocol (IP).

26. The applicant associates the logical IP sets with the logical device. It is not clear what constitutes an IP set because the Specification defines an IP set as "...any conventional digital telephony device..." **[0048 of the Pg Pub for the instant application]**.

27. Lastly, the Applicant is arguing features that are not required by the claims, namely the claims do not require the logical device to be an IP set. The Examiner views this as being a reasonable interpretation since the Specification only mentions the logical device in the Summary of the Invention section and does not appear to define a logical device as being an IP set **[0007 of the Pg Pub for the instant application]**.

#### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JEFFREY M. RUTKOWSKI whose telephone number is (571)270-1215. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30-5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou can be reached on (571) 272-3088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jeffrey M Rutkowski  
Patent Examiner  
09/07/2008

/Hassan Kizou/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2619